UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,860	08/12/2005	Thierry Bernard	930092-2009	4878
Ronald R Santu	7590 02/22/200 Icci	EXAMINER		
Frommer Lawre	_	KNOX, STEWART		
745 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10151			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3641	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/22/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/522,860	BERNARD, THIERRY		
Examiner	A 4 1 1 14		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	STEWART I. KNOX	3641	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>01 February 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (iii)	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	iance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
3.  ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below.)	sideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		1	DTOL 004)
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	-	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul> <li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (</li> <li>13. ☑ Other: See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Michael J. Carone/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3640			

Continuation of 13. Other: The amendments as filed appear mainly to recite parts of claim 2 into claim 1, describing how the cables connect to one another by penetrating into the inside of the other cable which is covered, in more detail, in claim 2. As such, the amendments do not appear to recite any substantially different material from that evaluated in the final rejection. While the Examiner agrees that Manual Tecnico does not disclose electrical connections and the arrangement of pins, it was never relied upon for that teaching. Rather, Holtzapple and the state of the art with regard to the use of electrical detonators was relied upon for such a teaching. Applicant further notes several features which are not present in the claims, i.e. a second firing control cable and assembly without baring the electrical wires, which are not relevant to the present rejection.

Applicant further argues that the arrangement of Holtzapple does not show a cable that is "solid" with the tap wire. However, the Examiner's position has been and continues to be that the term "solid" is sufficiently broad as to include the arrangement of Holtzapple, absent any more specific definition in the specification or known in the art.

Applicant further argues that multiple conduction connectors would not be able to insulate between separate parts of a cable, however none of this is recited in the claims and is thus irrelevant. As it is claimed, the recitation of more than one connection conductor merely amounts to duplication of the essential working parts. Finally, the use of pre-stripped wires is again irrelevant, since it is not claimed one way or the other.